

Information Resources Management Board

REPORT OF IRMB RETREAT

March 23, 2001

Attendees: Barbara Weaver, OLIS (Chair); Lee Arnold, Ph.D./William Fagan, DLT; James Berard, DOC; Howard Boksenbaum/Carol Ciotola, OLIS; Hon. Frank Caprio, Senate Finance Committee; Hon. Daniel DaPonte, RI Senate; Bea Frazer/Thomas Mullaney, Budget Office—DOA; William Holland, Ed.D./William Ferland, OHE; Michael Hogan, RI House Policy Office; Hon. Edward Inman III, Secretary of State; Ed Giroux/Gwenn Stearn, Secretary of State's Office; Janet Levesque, RILOCAT; Dexter Merry, Public Telecommunications Authority; James R. Monti, Jr., West Warwick School Department; Joseph Pangborn, Department of Elementary & Secondary Education; A. Kathryn Power/Kathleen Spangler, MHRH; Bruce Reirden, Care New England; Don Wolfe, Brown University

Members Absent: Paul Gandel, URI; Joan Ress Reeves, Library Board of Rhode Island

Purpose of Retreat: To develop input for next five-year plan of IRMB as required by law.

Agenda: (attached)

Decisions Made:

Five-Year Plan Elements

Vision and Mission Statements: The IRMB members confirmed that the existing Vision and Mission Statements continue to be valid and should be retained in the next version of the five-year plan to be adopted by the Board.

Goals: The Board members agreed that the five existing goal areas remaining from the initial five-year plan continue to be valid; however, they suggested that two goal areas—Public Access and E-Government—be combined. They also recommended that two additional goal areas be included: Telecommunications Integration and Security/ Privacy Policy.

The Board requested that once the Financial Management Information System (now called Rhode Island Statewide Automated Information Link) is operating—now scheduled for July 1, 2001—that a report be made to the IRMB on how well it is working, what else needs to be done, etc.

Objectives, Benchmarks, and Evaluation: These items should be developed by staff and brought to the Board for review and approval. The plan should include major accomplishments as well as future-oriented activities.

The new Telecommunications Integration goal area should include evaluation of the existing infrastructure and a plan for consolidating and coordinating voice, data, and video throughout state government. Substantial accomplishments to date should be emphasized.

The new Security/Privacy policy goal should take into account existing policies plus issues relating to the new portal development and the fact that there will be links to sites that are not under control of either the state or the vendor. The Open Records Law may require or proscribe certain types of information being shared that may interfere with desired protocols in the new portal. Also, there are issues relating to the new HIPAA regulations concerning data sharing and privacy of individual information. The IRMB should adopt policies that are minimum requirements on every state agency; each agency is then free to make more stringent policy requirements as needed for its own operations.

Concerns relating to the goal area of Safeguarding Existing Services include the need to assure that resources are leveraged statewide, and the need to encourage training and development of workforce assets. OLIS staff should work with the various departments and agencies to assess the level of duplication of IT bureaucracy, including staffing.

Role of the IRMB

The Board serves as a link between the various departments and their needs for information resources as they affect each department's business mission, and the statewide needs for infrastructure operated and supported by OLIS within DOA. (See attached diagram).

The major functions of the IRMB are to:

1. Oversee governance
 - develop policies
 - promulgate standards
 - develop and monitor goals
2. Act as public relations and advocacy group
3. Support the Chief Information Officer

There was general agreement that the Board should have a global view of where the state is at any time as to the Board's vision and mission. The Board should not become involved in day-to-day operation of either OLIS or individual departments. The Board should avoid management of decision-making at any level; rather, the Board should limit its functions to overall policy and strategic direction.

It is important that the Board receive regularly scheduled "snapshot" assessments of system status and coordination of projects throughout state government.

An issue still unresolved is the relationship between the IRMB and individual state departments and agencies with respect to making decisions about what information technology they should purchase. This relates to the provisions in Article 6 of Governor Almond's proposed FY 2002 budget, a copy of which was distributed as part of the retreat packet for IRMB members.

It was pointed out that information technology is merely a tool for departments and agencies to conduct their business and is not an end in itself. Whatever tool is most appropriate to get the job done is the one that should be selected. That selection should be made by the department so long as the selection complies with standards and policies adopted statewide and implemented through OLIS.

Article 6

There was considerable discussion of the proposed Article 6, with the strong recommendation by the IRMB that several IRMB members meet as soon as possible with Dr. Carl, the State Budget Officer, and the Governor's Policy Director to express the concerns of IRMB members about the specificity of tasks required of the IRMB, as well as the short timeline for accomplishing the tasks.

Project Investment Document

The CIO pointed out that the PID had been sent to all major departments earlier in the week (a copy of the cover letter and forms were included in the retreat packet). The draft PID, which had been modified by an IRMB ad hoc committee from an existing document used by the state of Arizona, had been distributed to the IRMB a few months previous, and the IRMB had approved it in concept with the understanding that the CIO would finalize and distribute it to departments. A major issue for retreat participants was the fact that the PID time line was compressed in order to comply with Article 6 in case Article 6 was adopted as part of the final FY 2002 budget.

The Board members instructed the CIO to set up a meeting with Dr. Carl, Mr. McAllister and a representative from the Governor's Office to discuss the concerns the IRMB had with the level of detail and specificity required of the IRMB itself, as well as the abbreviated timeline.

The Board also instructed the CIO to postpone discussion of the PID with the IRMB workgroup until there could be a resolution as to IRMB's role and the required timeline.

IRMB Membership

The Board members agreed that all the present appointees were appropriate. Suggested additions included representatives from the Economic Development Corporation, the Governor's Justice Commission, the Governor's Commission on Disabilities, and additional Cabinet members. On a trial basis, the CIO will invite these representatives to attend IRMB meetings. At some future time, it may be advisable to add them to the representatives specified in law.

Meeting Arrangements

The Board members agreed that it is preferable to schedule monthly meetings, with the option of canceling a specific meeting if it is not necessary.

The suggestion was made to establish an Executive Committee of the Board to oversee the development of the state portal.

Other

It was also suggested that it may be useful to have staff budgeted and assigned to Board activities.

Next Steps:

1. Meet with Dr. Carl, et. al., regarding Article 6.
2. Halt implementation of PID until Article 6 issue is resolved.
3. Immediately begin to develop security policy.
4. Assess project coordination.
5. Finish the plan, including specific accomplishments.
6. Explore possibility of budget for Board